

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 01 2007

70049-00002

PAGE 1/4 \* RCVD AT 6/1/2007 3:13:46 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/3 \* DNS:2738300 \* CSID: \* DURATION (mm:ss):01:14

Patent Docket:  
70049-00002

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 11 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

CHUNG, Keicy K.

Serial No.: 10/017,923

Filed: October 30, 2001

For: READ-ONLY STORAGE DEVICE  
HAVING NETWORK INTERFACE, A  
SYSTEM INCLUDING THE  
DEVICE, AND A METHOD OF  
DISTRIBUTING FILES OVER A  
NETWORK

Group Art Unit: 2143

Examiner: Refai, Ramsey

Sent via Facsimile to:  
571.273.8300

**AGENDA FOR APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW**

Dear Examiner Refai:

I am writing to confirm the in-person interview scheduled for June 18, 2007, at 3 PM concerning the above-encaptioned patent application, and to provide an agenda for the meeting.

The following individuals, exclusive of USPTO personnel, are anticipated to be in attendance:

David M. Morse, Applicant's Representative

Keicy K. Chung, Applicant

At the interview, we anticipate showing, but not demonstrating, an exemplar of a storage device which is constructed in accordance with the recitations of claim 1. We also anticipate presenting the arguments identified below with the aid of a white board for illustration purposes.

Patent Docket:  
70049-00002RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERIssues For Discussion

JUN 01 2007

1) The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) of the amendment to paragraphs [0025] and [0028] for the addition of new matter will be raised. Documentation will be presented to establish that the term "direct attached storage" was a term of art and that each of the protocols listed in the present application, namely the IDE, ATA, SCSI, and IEEE 1394 protocols, were inherently known as forms of "direct attached storage" at the time the present application was filed.

☐ Discussed☐ Agreed☐ Not Agreed

2) The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 7 over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,237 to Jacobs et al. will be raised. This discussion will center around the differences between networked-based caching systems and caching that is performed at the local storage level according to claim 7. The Jacobs et al. reference discloses the former, while the present application is directed toward the latter. We will discuss the differences between the Jacobs et al. system and the system of claim 7, focusing on why they are sufficiently different to warrant allowance of claim 7.

☐ Discussed☐ Agreed☐ Not Agreed

3) The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 1, 4, 10, 11, and 14 over the Jacobs et al. reference will be raised to the extent any issues remain with these claims following the discussion of items 1 and 2 above. In order to highlight the differences between the combinations cited in the rejections and the claimed subject matter, and particularly the teachings of the Jacobs et al. reference, the commercial advantages presented by the claimed subject matter will be presented in the areas of

Patent Docket:  
70049-00002

computer boot processes and file protection systems, both of which are addressed in the specification as filed. It is anticipated that the commercial advantages will illustrate that the rejected claims are directed toward patentably distinct subject matter as compared to the cited combinations.

☐ Discussed

☐ Agreed

☐ Not Agreed

Respectfully submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

DATE: June 1, 2007

By: 

David M. Morse  
Reg. No. 50,505

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP  
Wells Fargo Center  
South Tower, Suite 3150  
355 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
(213) 787-2500